

Wednesday, November 20th 1991

Today's Topics:

Re: The Latest on UK Crop Circles
The Sphinx
sphinx age
Weird Night On Halloween
Re: Weird Night On Halloween
Implants
End Of Ogden?
OMNI - your opinion
Re: The End of Freedom
Re: Crop Circles
Hyser report
Hyser Report
David Jacobs
Mystery Object - cross post
The Sphinx Again...
UFO survey
David Jacobs
Weird Night On Halloween
Weird Night On Halloween
interview
Crop Circles

From: Linda.Bird@p0.f8.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Linda Bird)
Subject: Re: The Latest on UK Crop Circles
Date: 16 Nov 91 03:23:48 GMT

Hi Robert,

What depressing news about that conference you went to. There's some hope, however, as Australia enters its planting/harvesting season that some crop circle will appear there, and be magnificent.

(Did you get the material I sent you?)

Best,

Linda Bird

--

Linda Bird - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Linda.Bird@p0.f8.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Linda.Bird@p0.f8.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Linda Bird)
Subject: The Sphinx
Date: 16 Nov 91 03:35:44 GMT

Hi David,

Thanks for the latest on the Sphinx. This info is all new to me, too. I DO know that the author and historian Zecharia Sitchin has plenty to say about the pyramids. He thinks the Great Pyramid was built a few hundred thousand years ago and used as a type of beacon for Ancient Astronauts (see his book, "The Wars of Gods and Men" for details).

I'd like to see MUFON or CUFOS get Sitchin's opinion on the Sphinx. I can't remember right now if he discussed it or not.

Regards,

Linda

--

Linda Bird - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Linda.Bird@p0.f8.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Clark.Matthews@f816.n107.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Clark Matthews)
Subject: sphinx age
Date: 16 Nov 91 14:02:00 GMT

In a message to Wam.Umd.Edu!Infinity <15 Nov 91 13:52> Danny Brandenburg wrote:

DB> The team visited the Sphinx outside of Cairo in April and examined
DB> the sandstone believed to have been carved during the reign of Pharaoh
DB> Chephren, also known as Pharaoh Khafre, who died in 2494 B.C.
DB> The examination revealed cracks and weathering in the rock of the
DB> type usually caused by long periods of rainfall.
DB> The same weathering was not found on other stone structures from the
DB> age in the area, including the nearby Great Pyramids.

Hi Danny -- the jury's out on this and I don't know anything about the report these people presented, but the Sphinx is sandstone, whereas the pyramids were sheathed in marble throughout the classical age. The marble was scavenged by local builders over the centuries following the Ptolemaic collapse.

My point here is that it would be VERY difficult for the Sphinx panel to make a meaningful comparison between the erosion present on the Sphinx vs. the nearby landmarks. The surface materials of the pyramids are long gone.

DB> ``Pharaoh Chephren evidently repaired and refurbished the weathered
DB> Sphinx around 2500 B.C., but he did not build it,'' Schoch said.

The Pharaohs had a long history of doing this -- and of taking credit for building their predecessor's monuments -- no doubt about it.

DB> If a civilization older than the ancient Egyptians built the Sphinx,
DB> there could be other relics still to be discovered beneath the desert
DB> sand, Schoch said.
DB> Seismograph studies of the ground around the statue indicated
DB> channels cut into the sandstone bedrock. The findings might mean the
DB> Sphinx was built on top of an ancient cliff that has since filled in
DB> with sand.

The subterranean channels/chambers/tunnels have been known for some time and suspected for centuries. You know what strikes me as being really interesting about this?? I keep thinking about what Edgar Cayce prophesied about the Sphinx: That incontrovertible evidence of ATLANTIS is preserved in undiscovered chambers below and in front of the Sphinx.

Of course, Cayce also said that when the evidence is uncovered -- the world will soon suffer a major cataclysm.

Best,
Clark

--

Clark Matthews - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Clark.Matthews@f816.n107.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Peggy Noonan)
Subject: Weird Night On Halloween
Date: 17 Nov 91 17:52:00 GMT

> > and then cited the crop circles as a possible proof
> > while noting the animal mutilations as a factual proof of alien
> > visitors.

> Unfortunately neither of these things constitutes proof of
> alien visitations. The only proof they provide is of strange
> crop formations and strange animal mutilations. Both mysteries
> are still whodunits.

Quite right, John. That's what I meant but I didn't express it very

well. The problem is that these people have already accepted these things as sufficient proof to satisfy themselves and assume that makes these things sufficient proof for everyone else too. Belief doesn't make fact, though. That acceptance of "fact" (which others would merely call interesting but unexplained phenomena) cast doubt on the credibility of all the rest of their contentions. Sorry I didn't explain myself better the first time.

BTW, I'm collecting opinions and would value yours very highly:
Topic -- OMNI magazine. What do you like best/least about it? What would you change if you could influence the editors? Would you increase the coverage of UFO-Paranormal events/reports or reduce it? Should those stories have more of an investigative (as opposed to straight story-telling or reporting) tone? Or would you decrease coverage there? Is there something the magazine does that you'd prefer they didn't do? Something they should do that they're not now doing? And what do you wish the editors knew -- what would you tell them if you could?

Second topic -- OMNI ONLINE: What do you think of the idea of OMNI going online? There's been some talk about them joining some of the CIS/GENIE type services or other BBS so interested people could talk to the editors and writers directly, get answers, etc. Good idea? Any suggestions?

[Note -- anyone else who would like to comment on these questions, feel free to jump in too.]

Thanks for thinking about it. I'll look forward to your reply.

==Peggy==

--

Peggy Noonan - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Peggy Noonan)
Subject: Re: Weird Night On Halloween
Date: 17 Nov 91 17:59:00 GMT

>Still have not seen the whole show yet. I did have a devil of a
>time all weekend (in costume) so the tape sits in the VCR
>waiting for me to sit still for an hour.

>

>I got the GIFs of the Ogden object, but the printer or program
>here makes hash out of them. So I still know nothing. (as
>usual?)

>

>The Orcadian is the weekly newspaper of Orkney. Nothing special
>in three issues so far. Big news about a roundabout that was
>the first on the mainland, and that they had three accidents
>the first week. The ban on shellfish has been removed,
>Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning. First annual Science Festival...

>Nothing about archaeology or paranormal yet.

I know what you mean about the GIFs -- I haven't been able to see them either, as I don't have graphics (only Hercules which evidently is not enough) but I hadn't tried printing it...probably wouldn't work, judging by your experience. They're copies of Linda Bird's drawings and Linda was kind enough to send me photocopies of same (Thank you again, Linda -- you're the only one who came through!) so I would happily relay copies to you if you like. Send me a netmail or whatever of your mailing address and I'll mail you copies. Meantime we can both save up for advanced graphics capability!

Thanks for the info about the Orkadian (sp?) -- Interesting stuff.

BTW, I'm collecting opinions about OMNI magazine -- if you want to add yours, I'd appreciate it. General stuff: what do you like/dislike, what would you tell the editors if you could speak directly to them, is there enough or too much UFO-Paranormal coverage, should there be more coverage of archaeology, etc., and what about an OMNI ONLINE service -- would you use it? like it? Thanks.

==Peggy==

--

Peggy Noonan - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Peggy Noonan)

Subject: Implants

Date: 17 Nov 91 18:04:00 GMT

>Hello Peggy...

> > >Peggy, in a message on 12th Oct you mentioned a radio
> > show>which included a man who talked about a personal
> > abduction and
> > >implant.
> > >Do you by chance have any further details on him?

> > name: Richard Price
> > He says he was implanted by aliens and that
>This case sounds very interesting.

>If at all possible, I would like to obtain a copy of your audio
>tape. I would send you the postage and cost prior to you
>sending it to me,

>Can you provide any more insight as to the physical and
>structural characteristics?

Hello Keith,

I'm sorry to say that I still have not been able to make time to listen to the entire interview yet -- things here have been very, very busy -- but I would be happy to send a copy of the tape to you. I can also ask the radio host who interviewed him if he would be able to provide a contact telephone number or address if you would find that helpful. Please let me know your mailing address and I'll send a copy as soon as possible. About the expenses, it would cause time-gobbling delay to wait for mails back and forth so I will trust you to merely reimburse when you receive, okay? I'll look forward to the message with the mailing address.

==Peggy==

--

Peggy Noonan - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Peggy Noonan)

Subject: End Of Ogden?

Date: 17 Nov 91 18:10:00 GMT

Hi Sheldon,

I, too, was sorry to see that I couldn't get any further with the Ogden story. Thank you very much for your kind comments -- that helps!

Of course, it's still remotely (very remotely) possible that the people could change their minds and eventually decide to talk, but it's also remotely possible that the rest of the unsolved mysteries will be solved too... (g) I won't hold my breath, anyway.

Many people are wondering about the too-many-for-mere-chance stories like this one...does give one reason to ponder. MICAP, I hope, will address some of these questions -- the source of the strange story phenomenon -- when they're more fully underway.

Thanks very much for the suggestion about the mutilation story. As soon as I wrap what I'm working on now, I'll contact Jim about that. Couldn't look into it before because the other stories too priority, but this may turn out to be very good stuff -- especially if people will actually agree to be interviewed for a change!

Thanks, again!

==Peggy==

--

Peggy Noonan - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Peggy Noonan)
Subject: OMNI - your opinion
Date: 17 Nov 91 18:16:00 GMT

Sheldon,

As you may have seen in my message to John Hicks (#2030), I'm collecting opinions about OMNI and since you made such interesting comments about Sherry Baker's "Moon Babies" story recently, I would appreciate hearing from you too on this topic. I'll relay the general comments and some specific ones to the editors -- unless you specify I should not do so -- so you'll have a chance to influence the magazine as much as any of us ordinary folk can.

Basic idea: what do you like/dislike about the magazine; what should they do less of/more of; should there be more/less/same amount of UFO-Paranormal coverage; should that coverage take a more investigative tone or remain in the storytelling reporting style; is there anything the magazine isn't doing that it should do or is doing that it shouldn't, and so on. One question comes to mind specifically in response to your "Moon Babies" comments -- do you think there should be a Skeptics Page or feature -- that is, a place where someone can rebut a story as you did the Moon Babies piece? (I would visualize it as a column or 1/2 page where the original item would be reprinted with the skeptic's rebuttal and a different skeptic or reader-skeptic would be used each time, depending on who wrote in with what evidence, etc.) Second question: If they go to an OMNI ONLINE feature, would you participate in it? What would be the do's and don't's for that?

Thanks for thinking about this.

==Peggy==

--

Peggy Noonan - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Peggy.Noonan@p0.f150.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Kay.Mclaughlin@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Kay McLaughlin)
Subject: Re: The End of Freedom
Date: 11 Nov 91 02:51:00 GMT

CM> Okay, okay, call me a bad-tempered bastard who refuses to
CM> acknowledge the humanity of the people who tap my phones, snoop
CM> on these message echos (as human BBS callers and thru anonymous UNIX

CM> FTPs) and who may someday come knocking on my door at 5 a.m.

REALLY??

Has this been occurring? Care to elaborate?

CM> I mean, the Nazis liquidated 6 million Jews and 9 million
CM> "politicals" and POWs by using notecards in shoeboxes. Just
CM> think what they could do with the INSLAW software package
CM> (in one form or another)?

I think I missed something, what is the INSLAW?

CM> Since you're in the D.C. area you've obviously heard all about the
CM> Maryland "Big Foot" flap. I defer to your expertise on that one.

I live in the DC area, and I haven'r heard about the Maryland BIG Foot
flap, Clark, Steve have any files on this?

Regards,
Kay

--

Kay McLaughlin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Kay.McLaughlin@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Powell@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Powell)
Subject: Re: Crop Circles
Date: 16 Nov 91 06:12:00 GMT

--> Quoting Jim Speiser to John Powell <=

JS> In a message to Sheldon Wernikoff <30 Oct 91 22:58> John Powell wrote:
JS> Well, the shameless media-presented (and sponsored by who knows...) ploy to
JP> discredit the totality of the phenomenon with this single pathetic prank,
JP> (which essentially amounted to just a personal attack on Delgado), might
JP> have worked well in the past but things/people change.

JS> Just one question that needs to be asked. What was it about the Geezer
JS> circle that caused Delgado to go out on such a limb?
JS> OK, another question: Would any other Cereologist have been fooled?

There's no way for me to realistically answer that question. What caused these
people to, (how did they get in the corner?), think that they were in _any_
way capable of determining a 'true' CC from a 'fake' CC?

Hindsight, which is almost always 20/20, tells us that they used subtle
configuration details, such as stalk weaving or criss-cross plant folding, in

their analysis. They used "ley lines" and dowsing - whatever _they_ are...

In the case of the former that is an acceptable method of categorization of the characteristics of the alleged phenomenon. It proves nothing.

In the case of the later, dowsing and such, it is simply unacceptable on all counts and for all purposes.

How did they get in that corner? I don't know. But I _do_ know that it is a _personal_ question, having nothing to do with the scientific pursuit of knowledge, and history will remind them of this question as time progresses.

Fortunately, there are now beginning to be solidly verifiable lab-based sample analysis methods, (our version of Spock's Tricorder...), that will put the past in the past - which is exactly where it belongs.

Andrews, perhaps Delgado, will likely be one of many on-site teams whose role is to specifically to collect the immediate forensic data, catalog the observations, and then pass the baton...

Assuming, of course, that this phenomenon decides to continue vandalizing the otherwise regal fields with it's otherwise blockhead version of art...

JS> I'm not implying anything, I'm asking an honest question,
JS> which I guess is this: what constitutes a "true" crop circle, and how
JS> are WE supposed to tell the difference, if one of the world's leading
JS> cereologists cannot?

Let me be the one to make things even _more_ difficult to swallow... <grin>

The plain fact of the matter is that we have no choice but to _DISREGARD_ all previous crop circle data... We have no choice but to go into next year with our best lab-based testing resources, verify for an independently corroborated fact that these lab-based testing resources _can_ distinguish truth from fiction to a _reasonably_ acceptable degree, and start from there...

Now let me insult you with a prediction: The Crop Circle phenomenon of 1992 will be _drastically_ reduced, it will be _less_ than 1/4 the total event number of 1991. Somewhere between 50% and 80% of those 1992 events will be conclusively shown to _not_ match known lab-based analysis criteria. The remainder will endure in an inconclusive wasteland of dwindling speculation as the myth establishes permanent roots...

You heard it here first... <grin>

Thanks.

John.

... Absence of Evidence is not Evidence of Absence.

--

John Powell - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: John.Powell@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Hyser report
Date: 17 Nov 91 06:40:00 GMT

> I can explain it with Ed pretty easily in my own mind. I still have a
> hard time with Meier, the one armed expert photographer,

Maybe the "suspect" didn't actually do the hoaxing. Maybe the suspect is simply a conduit, or front man, and can truthfully say he knows nothing about faking photos.

> immediately sets out to hoax the same pictures

But we could just as easily someday demonstrate how to hoax a real TRUFO photo. And if we did out-hoax a potential hoaxer, we still haven't proved his photos to be fake, just that it can be done.

jbh

--

John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Hyser Report
Date: 18 Nov 91 07:56:00 GMT

> Sure, no problem. Didn't you or Don get a scanner and OCR software a
> while back? I'm in the market and looking for advice. Could come in
> handy.

Give me a voice call sometime. I am glad to help.

Mike

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: David Jacobs
Date: 18 Nov 91 13:23:00 GMT

> Come on people, let's get Dave back on line. It shouldn't be
> THAT difficult. Perhaps he can be setup as a point?

Thank you for posting that update, Sheldon. As a matter of fact, we are testing a new link in the Philadelphia area even as we speak. It should be functional in very short order.

Mike

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: ASTRO.dnet.ge.com!CARR
Subject: Mystery Object - cross post
Date: 18 Nov 91 18:33:41 GMT

From: Paul Carr <CARR@ASTRO.dnet.ge.com>

#: 93980 S14/News/Current Events
13-Nov-91 18:24:55
Sb: #Mystery Object!
Fm: SKY & TELESCOPE 70007,2762
To: All

Okay, WHAT IS OUT THERE??!! The two latest IAU Circulars describe a most unusual 20th-magnitude object in Cetus, which has been under scrutiny by the Spacewatch telescope in Arizona since November 6th. Orbital solutions by Brian G. Marsden indicate it has an orbit remarkably similar to that of the Earth -- as if it is 'dogging' our planet! In the low-key language of the IAU Circulars, the suggestion is made that it 'might be a returning spacecraft.'

Dr. Marsden has told S&T that if it is the hulk of some interplanetary probe, it might have been launched either 16 or 32 years ago. On that assumption, maybe it's time to start looking at what probes were being launched by the U. S. and U. S. S. R. in 1959 and 1975.

The object is heading slowly toward a rendezvous with Earth on December 5th,

when it will be 0.0031 astronomical unit away (the Moon's distance is 0.0026 a.u.).

In case anyone wants to explore the past motion of this object, the elements given by Marsden on IAU Circular 5387 are as follows:

Epoch = 1991 Oct. 31.0 ET	
T = 1992 Jan. 14.1186 ET	Arg. peri. = 260.8887
e = 0.065262	Long. node = 212.9200 (1950.0)
q = 0.971470 a.u.	Inclination = 0.3913
a = 1.039297	Period 1.060 years

The approach to Earth will change these elements considerably. For example, by early January the argument of perihelion becomes 26 degrees, and the longitude of the ascending node 79 degrees!

-- Roger

#: 94006 S14/News/Current Events
14-Nov-91 09:01:54
Sb: #93980-Mystery Object!
Fm: Frank Hentschel 75126,72
To: SKY & TELESCOPE 70007,2762 (X)

A quick look through my database shows the following in that time frame:

Name	Catnr	Intdes	Source	Launch	Decay/Status
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
PIONEER 5	27	ALPHA 1	US	11 MAR 60	SOLAR ORB
VENERA 1	80	GAMMA 1	USSR	12 FEB 61	SOLAR ORB
LUNA 1	112	MU 1	USSR	02 JAN 59	SOLAR ORB
PIONEER 4	113	NU 1	US	03 MAR 59	SOLAR ORB
HELIOS 1	7567	1974 097A	FRG	10 DEC 74	SOLAR ORB
HELIOS 2	8582	1976 003A	FRG	15 JAN 76	SOLAR ORB

cheers -fjh

From: us1.edu!pgf9240
Subject: The Sphinx Again...
Date: 19 Nov 91 02:33:39 GMT

From: pgf9240@us1.edu (Fraering Philip G)

Just thought I'd comment: if the Sphinx and the Pyramids are older than we think, this explains the old theory, 'if they were built using

ropes and wood, where did it come from? 4000 years ago the Nile valley was a desert...' by means of the fact that when they were built, the region perhaps wasn't a desert but fertile.

Phil

From: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: UFO survey
Date: 16 Nov 91 00:57:13 GMT

In a message to All <15 Nov 91 22:00> Sheldon Wernikoff wrote:

SW> I happened to catch Bud Hopkins on the Jennie Long show (NBC) today
SW> at about 2:30 P.M. CST. Unfortunately, I only saw the first few minutes,
SW> but found the results of a studio survey quite interesting.

SW> The audience was asked:

SW> Do you believe in UFO's?

SW> The response was:

SW> Believers: 53%

SW> Non-believers: 47%

SW> This ratio is down dramatically from 10 years ago, and does basically
SW> agree with other recent polls.

SW> Is our credibility waning?

That's actually better than a recent TIME Magazine poll, which I believe showed non-believers in the majority.

Yes, I'd say our credibility is waning, but not substantially, which is surprising considering the miasmic mire we've been bogged down in lately.

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: David Jacobs
Date: 16 Nov 91 00:59:05 GMT

In a message to All <15 Nov 91 22:01> Sheldon Wernikoff wrote:

SW> Come on people, let's get Dave back on line. It shouldn't be
SW> THAT difficult. Perhaps he can be setup as a point?

I agree, but is anyone willing to poll him Long Distance? He told me that the UFO interest in the Philly area is virtually non-existent, and I guess that is echoed in the ParaNet interest.

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Weird Night On Halloween
Date: 19 Nov 91 17:30:00 GMT

PN> BTW, I'm collecting opinions and would value yours very
PN> highly: Topic -- OMNI magazine.

Unfortunately I don't read it enough to have a valid opinion. Not enough hours in the day.

Anyway, I usually look through it for ufo stuff, of which I don't see enough. Just a simply "news flash" column about what's happening would be good.

PN> Second topic -- OMNI ONLINE: What do you think of the idea
PN> of OMNI going online?

Good idea.....but not on a pay service. Go with Fidonet; the communications and goodwill would probably pay off. Plus, Fido would be "neutral territory."

jbh

--

John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Weird Night On Halloween
Date: 19 Nov 91 01:51:57 GMT

In a message to Pete Porro <17 Nov 91 10:59> Peggy Noonan wrote:

PN>
PN> BTW, I'm collecting opinions about OMNI magazine -- if you want
PN> to add yours, I'd appreciate it. General stuff: what do you
PN> like/dislike, what would you tell the editors if you could speak
PN> directly to them, is there enough or too much UFO-Paranormal
PN> coverage, should there be more coverage of archaeology, etc., and
PN> what about an OMNI ONLINE service -- would you use it? like it? Thanks.
PN> ==Peggy==

May I add my two cents? I think OMNI has just the right amount of coverage of UFO/Paranormal for a magazine of its type, but I would like to see it analyze the paranormal more critically. Right now all it seems to do is report claims, and once in a while throw in an obligatory quote from a skeptic. I think that when something seems to be real, you should say so, and when it seems to be fraudulent, you should say so as well.

As far as an online service, good luck. They tried that on CompuServe for a while, without much success.

Jim

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: interview
Date: 20 Nov 91 07:23:41 GMT

In a message to Jim Speiser <15 Nov 91 19:04> Deane Ward wrote:

DW> Sorry to unload like this and I too can be skeptical but crudely
DW> and rudely as he was is beneath me. I need some calming potent
DW> as you can see.

DW> Tell Mary HELLO and hope to see you soon

Hi Deane!

thanks for your note about Mike. That sure is an eye-opener. I know he's still very skeptical, but I thought I had at least convinced him that Klass is no White Knight. He's agreed with me in public, in fact. I'll be talking to him on the new GENie paranormal roundtable, where I'm one of his assistants. You didn't get a tape, by any chance, did you?

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Crop Circles
Date: 20 Nov 91 07:25:51 GMT

In a message to Jim Speiser <15 Nov 91 23:12> John Powell wrote:

JP> You heard it here first... <grin>

I knew there was SOME reason I tuned in here! <grin> Thanks for the thoughtful reply, and I agree, we'll just have to <cringe><gritting teeth> WAIT AND SEE....

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@p666.f100.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG

*****To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to*****
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,csn}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com

For administrative requests (subscriptions, back issues) send to:

UUCP {ncar,isis,csn}!scicom!infopara-request
DOMAIN infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com

To obtain back issues by anonymous ftp, connect to:

DOMAIN ftp.uiowa.edu (directory /archives/paranet)

Mail to private Paranet/Fidonet addresses from the newsletters:

DOMAIN firstname.lastname@paranet.org

UUCP scicom!paranet.org!firstname.lastname

*****The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter*****